

1 WAYMO LLC,

2 No. C 17-00939 WHA

3 Plaintiff,


4 v.

5 UBER TECHNOLOGIES, INC., *et al.*,6 **ORDER DENYING REQUEST**  
**FOR CLARIFICATION OF**  
**JUDGE CORLEY'S ORDER**

7 Defendants.

8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Incidental to their motion for relief from Judge Corley's order granting plaintiff Waymo  
16 LLC's motion to compel, defendants Uber Technologies, Inc., and Ottomotto LLC asked for  
17 clarification that, while Judge Corley's order requires production of Stroz Friedberg's due  
18 diligence report at this time, its rationale as to the "common interest" or "joint defense"  
19 exception is not necessarily dispositive of privilege assertions over other communications,  
20 separate and apart from the due diligence report, that occurred after April 11, 2016 (*see* Dkt.  
21 No. 575 at 5). This request does not bear on production of the due diligence report and should  
22 be directed first to Judge Corley, who remains in the best position to evaluate it, per her recent  
23 instructions regarding Uber's privilege log (*see* Dkt. No. 670 at 7-8). This order therefore  
24 **DENIES** the request without prejudice to its renewal before Judge Corley.  
25  
2627  
28 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

Dated: June 21, 2017.

  
WILLIAM ALSUP  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE